



State of Utah
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

Michael O. Leavitt Governor Robert L. Morgan Executive Director Lowell P. Braxton Division Director 1594 West North Temple, Suite 1210 PO Box 145801 Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-5801 (801) 538-5340 telephone (801) 359-3940 fax (801) 538-7223 TTY www.nr.utah.gov

October 16, 2002

CERTIFIED MAIL 7099 3400 0016 8895 6443

Tim Kirschbaum Consolidation Coal Company P.O. Box 566 Sesser, IL 62884

RE: Proposed Assessment for State Violation No. N02-39-1-2, Consolidation Coal Company, Emery Deep Mine, C/015/015, Compliance File Outgoing

Dear Mr. Kirschbaum:

The undersigned has been appointed by the Division of Oil, Gas & Mining as the Assessment Officer for assessing penalties under R645-401.

Enclosed is the proposed civil penalty assessment for the above referenced violation. The violation was issued by Division Inspector, Stephen J. Demczak, on September 13, 2002. Rule R645-401-600 et. seq. has been utilized to formulate the proposed penalty. By these rules, any written information which was submitted by you or your agent within fifteen (15) days of receipt of this Notice of Violation has been considered in determining the facts surrounding the violation and the amount of penalty.

Under R645-401-700, there are two informal appeal options available to you:

- 1. If you wish to informally appeal the <u>fact of this violation</u>, you should file a written request for an Informal Conference within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter. This conference will be conducted by the Division Director. This Informal Conference is distinct from the Assessment Conference regarding the proposed penalty.
- 2. If you wish to review the proposed penalty assessment, you should file a written request for an Assessment Conference within thirty (30) days of receipt of this letter. If you are also requesting a review of the fact of violation, as noted in paragraph 1, the Assessment Conference will be scheduled immediately following that review.



Sesser II Com 3800, February 2000
78879 11 p+d/Z energy Algorithm 12 miles Algorithm 200 Alg
Suoionisti voi
Hecipient's Name (Please Phint Clearly) (to be completed by mailer) Total Postage & Fees (Section 1) (to be completed by mailer) The consequent made (Section 2) (section 2) (section 3)
(bailipped and betolited
Return Recolpt Fee (Pendreamen Recoling) II.
Celtified Fee
Sostage \$ aperior
Compliance File
usau00)
U.S. Postal Service Coverage Provided) (Domestic Mail Only; No Insurance Coverage Provided)
U.S. Postal Service MECEIPT RECEIPT (Soverage Provided)

N02-39--1-2 C/015/015 October 16, 2002 Page 2

If a timely request for review is not made, the fact of violation will stand, the proposed penalty(ies) will become final, and the penalty(ies) will be due and payable within thirty (30) days of the proposed assessment. Please remit payment to the Division, mail c/o Vickie Southwick.

Sincerely,

Pamela Grubaugh-Littig

Assessment Officer

Enclosure

cc: OSM Compliance Report

Vickie Southwick, DOGM

O:\015015.EME\COMPLIANCE\2002\N02-39-1-2LTR.DOC

WORKSHEET FOR ASSESSMENT OF PENALTIES DIVISION OF OIL, GAS & MINING

			Consolidation C	oal Company				
	MIT <u>C/(</u> 7 / CO #		39-1-2, 1 of 2	VIOLATION	1 of 2			
ASS]	ESSMEN	IT DA	ΓE <u>October 7, 2</u>	002				
ASS]	ESSMEN	NT OFF	FICER Pamela Gr	ubaugh-Littig				
I.	HIST	HISTORY (Max. 25 pts.)						
	A.	A. Are there previous violations, which are not pending or vacated, which fall one (1) year of today's date?						
	PREV	IOUS	VIOLATIONS	EFFECTIVE DATE	POINTS			
								
				ast violation, up to one (1) year past violation in a CO, up to or es shall be counted				
				TOTAL H	IISTORY POINTS <u>0</u>			
II.	SERI	OUSN	ESS (Either A or I	3)				
	NOTE:		For assignment of	points in Parts II and III, the f	following apply:			
			Based on facts supplied by the inspector, the Assessment Officer will determine within each category where the violation falls.					
		2.	Beginning at the nadjust the points us statements as guid	nid-point of the category, the App or down, utilizing the inspecting documents.	Assessment Officer will ctor's and operator's			
	Is this an EVENT (A) or HINDRANCE (B) violation? Event (A)							
	A.	EVE	NT VIOLATION (N	Max 45 pts.)				
		1.	What is the event	which the violated standard w	as designed to prevent?			

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

Environmental Harm.

2. What is the probability of the occurrence of the event which a violated standard was designed to prevent?

PROBABILITY	<u>RANGE</u>
None	0
Unlikely	1-9
Likely	10-19
Occurred	20

ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS 9

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

The semi-trailer parked on top of the undisturbed vegetation and topsoil could inhibit future reclamation caused by a disturbance to soil compaction and vegetation.

3. What is the extent of actual or potential damage?

RANGE 0-25

In assigning points, consider the duration and extent of said damage or impact, in terms of area and impact on the public or environment.

ASSIGN DAMAGE POINTS 5

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

This action caused a disturbance to soil compaction and vegetation.

- B. <u>HINDRANCE VIOLATION</u> (Max 25 pts.)
 - 1. Is this a POTENTIAL or ACTUAL hindrance to enforcement? ____

RANGE 0-25

Assign points based on the extent to which enforcement is actually or potentially hindered by the violation.

ASSIGN HINDRANCE POINTS _____

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS (A or B) 14

III. NEGLIGENCE (Max 30 pts.)

A. Was this an inadvertent violation which was unavoidable by the exercise of reasonable care? IF SO--NO NEGLIGENCE; or, was this a failure of a permittee to prevent the occurrence of a violation due to indifference lack of diligence, or lack of reasonable care, or the failure to abate any violation due to the same? IF SO--GREATER DEGREE OF FAULT THAN NEGLIGENCE.

No Negligence 0
Negligence 1-15
Greater Degree of Fault 16-30

STATE DEGREE OF NEGLIGENCE Greater Degree

ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS <u>25</u>

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

The permittee was told on September 10, 2002 to remove the trailer from the undisturbed area where topsoil and vegetation had not been removed. On September 12, 2002, this violation was issued because the trailer had not been removed.

IV. GOOD FAITH (Max 20 pts.)

(Either A or B)

(Does not apply to violations requiring no abatement measures)

A. Did the operator have onsite, the resources necessary to achieve compliance of the violated standard within the permit area?

IF SO--EASY ABATEMENT

Easy Abatement Situation

• Immediate Compliance

-11 to -20*

(Immediately following the issuance of the NOV)

Rapid Compliance

-1 to -10

(Permittee used diligence to abate the violation)

• Normal Compliance

0

(Operator complied within the abatement period required) (Operator complied with condition and/or terms of

approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

^{*}Assign in upper of lower half of range depending on abatement occurring the 1st or 2nd half of abatement period.

B. Did the permittee not have the resources at hand to achieve compliance, or does the situation require the submission of plans prior to physical activity to achieve compliance?

IF SO--DIFFICULT ABATEMENT

Difficult Abatement Situation

• Rapid Compliance

-11 to -20*

(Permittee used diligence to abate the violation)

Normal Compliance

-1 to -10*

(Operator complied within the abatement period required)

• Extended Compliance

O

(Permittee took minimal actions for abatement to stay within the limits of the NOV or the violated standard of the plan submitted for abatement was incomplete)
(Permittee complied with conditions and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

EASY OR DIFFICULT ABATEMENT? <u>Easy</u>

ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS _-15

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

The trailer was removed the same day that the violation was written.

V. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

NOTICE OF VIOLATION # N02-39-1-2, 1 of 2			
I.	TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	0	
Π .	TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	14	
III.	TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	25	
IV.	TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	15	
	TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	24	
	TOTAL ASSESSED FINE	\$ 280	

O:\015015.EME\COMPLIANCE\2002\N02-39-1-2,1OF2WKSHT.DOC

WORKSHEET FOR ASSESSMENT OF PENALTIES DIVISION OF OIL, GAS & MINING

				oal Company/Emery Deep Mi	ne		
	MIT <u>C/</u> ' / CO #_		-N02-39-1-2	VIOLATION	2 of2		
			TE <u>October 7, 2002</u> FICER <u>Pamela Gr</u>				
I.		HISTORY (Max. 25 pts.)					
	A. Are there previous violations, which are not pending or vacated, which fall one (1) year of today's date?						
	PREVIOUS VIOLATIONS		VIOLATIONS	EFFECTIVE DATE	POINTS		
II.	CFDI	OUSN	No pending notice		HISTORY POINTS 0		
11.	NOTI		ESS (Either A or l	f points in Parts II and III, the	following apply:		
	1.		Based on facts su	pplied by the inspector, the As each category where the viola	ssessment Officer will		
		2.		mid-point of the category, the up or down, utilizing the inspeding documents.			
	Is this an EVENT (A) or HINDRANCE (B) violation? Event (A)						
	A. <u>EVENT VIOLATION</u> (Max 45 pts.)						
		1.	What is the event	which the violated standard w	vas designed to prevent?		

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

Untreated storm water leaving the disturbed area boundary.

2. What is the probability of the occurrence of the event which a violated standard was designed to prevent?

PROBABILITY	<u>RANGE</u>
None	0
Unlikely	1-9
Likely	10-19
Occurred	20

ASSIGN PROBABILITY OF OCCURRENCE POINTS 20

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

The untreated water went outside the disturbed area boundary.

3. What is the extent of actual or potential damage?

RANGE 0-25

In assigning points, consider the duration and extent of said damage or impact, in terms of area and impact on the public or environment.

ASSIGN DAMAGE POINTS 3

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

The potential existed for untreated storm water to contribute suspended solids to the riparian area.

- B. <u>HINDRANCE VIOLATION</u> (Max 25 pts.)
 - 1. Is this a POTENTIAL or ACTUAL hindrance to enforcement? ____

RANGE 0-25

Assign points based on the extent to which enforcement is actually or potentially hindered by the violation.

ASSIGN HINDRANCE POINTS _____

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS (A or B) 23

III. **NEGLIGENCE** (Max 30 pts.)

A. Was this an inadvertent violation which was unavoidable by the exercise of reasonable care? IF SO--NO NEGLIGENCE; or, was this a failure of a permittee to prevent the occurrence of a violation due to indifference lack of diligence, or lack of reasonable care, or the failure to abate any violation due to the same? IF SO--GREATER DEGREE OF FAULT THAN NEGLIGENCE.

> No Negligence Negligence 1-15 16-30 Greater Degree of Fault

STATE DEGREE OF NEGLIGENCE 25

ASSIGN NEGLIGENCE POINTS <u>25</u>

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

The permittee had been warned 30 days prior about the potential for this event as well as two days prior to the event.

IV. **GOOD FAITH (Max 20 pts.)**

(Either A or B)

(Does not apply to violations requiring no abatement measures)

A. Did the operator have onsite, the resources necessary to achieve compliance of the violated standard within the permit area?

IF SO--EASY ABATEMENT

Easy Abatement Situation

Immediate Compliance

-11 to -20*

(Immediately following the issuance of the NOV)

Rapid Compliance

-1 to -10

(Permittee used diligence to abate the violation)

Normal Compliance

(Operator complied within the abatement period required) (Operator complied with condition and/or terms of

approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

^{*}Assign in upper of lower half of range depending on abatement occurring the 1st or 2nd half of abatement period.

B. Did the permittee not have the resources at hand to achieve compliance, or does the situation require the submission of plans prior to physical activity to achieve compliance?

IF SO--DIFFICULT ABATEMENT

Difficult Abatement Situation

• Rapid Compliance

-11 to -20*

(Permittee used diligence to abate the violation)

• Normal Compliance

-1 to -10*

(Operator complied within the abatement period required)

• Extended Compliance

0

(Permittee took minimal actions for abatement to stay within the limits of the NOV or the violated standard of the plan submitted for abatement was incomplete) (Permittee complied with conditions and/or terms of approved Mining and Reclamation Plan)

EASY OR DIFFICULT ABATEMENT? <u>Easy</u>

ASSIGN GOOD FAITH POINTS _ -12

PROVIDE AN EXPLANATION OF POINTS:

Water bars were finished on September 13, 2002 (the day after the violation was issued and three days prior to the abatement date).

V. ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

NOT	ICE OF VIOLATION # <u>N02-39-1-1</u> ,	2 of 2
I.	TOTAL HISTORY POINTS	0
II.	TOTAL SERIOUSNESS POINTS	23
III.	TOTAL NEGLIGENCE POINTS	25
IV.	TOTAL GOOD FAITH POINTS	12
	TOTAL ASSESSED POINTS	36
		
	TOTAL ASSESSED FINE	\$ 520

O:\015015.EME\COMPLIANCE\2002\N02-39-1-2,2OF2WKSHT.DOC